

**MINUTES**  
**LEXINGTON COUNTY COUNCIL**

JUNE 03, 2003

Lexington County Council held its regular meeting on Tuesday June 03, 2003, in Council Chambers, beginning at 4:30 p.m. Chairman Davis presided; Mr. Wilkerson gave the invocation; Mr. Keisler led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Members attending:   George H. Smokey Davis       William C. Billy Derrick  
                              Bobby C. Keisler               Johnny W. Jeffcoat  
                              Joseph W. Joe Owens       M. Todd Cullum  
                              Bruce E. Rucker           Jacob R. Wilkerson  
                              John W. Carrigg, Jr.

Also attending: Art Brooks, County Administrator; Larry Porth, Finance Director/Deputy County Administrator; Katherine Doucett, Personnel Director/Deputy County Administrator; Jeff Anderson, County Attorney; other staff members, citizens of the county and representatives of the media.

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, a copy of the agenda was sent to radio and TV stations, newspapers, and posted on the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County Administration Building.

**Employee Recognition - Art Brooks, County Administrator** - Mr. Brooks recognized Richard Blackwell who is a Master Administration Graduate Student. Mr. Blackwell has been working on various personnel programs and shadowing department heads in order to get familiar with local governments.

Mr. Brooks recognized Charlie Compton, Planning Director, who has been with the County for 29 years. Mr. Compton was recently recognized by the Lexington County Soil and Water Conservation District at their meeting on May 8, 2003 for his years of service and innovation as a county planner. Mr. Compton was presented a plaque from the District.

Mr. Brooks recognized Ms. Louise Wise, a custodial employee, who works in the Building Services Department. Mr. Brooks stated that he received a very nice letter from the West Columbia Health Department commending Ms. Wise for her excellent work and wonderful attitude.

Mr. Brooks recognized Ms. Derrial Gardner for her kindness and helpfulness to the citizens of Lexington County.

Mr. Brooks recognized Loree Harmon, Dispatch Clerk- Public Works, Keith Fulmer, Foreman for Special Projects, Scott Rawl, John Frick and Albert Tobias, Crewmen. Mr. Brooks indicated that he had received an e-mail regarding an issue with a driveway and that Ms. Harmon was very informative, professional, courteous, and that her attitude had to be contagious. Mr. Brooks also received a nice call regarding Mr. Tobias' work and thoughtfulness and his unconditional act of kindness.

**Employee of First Quarter** - Nominees - Vicki Hallman, Identification Officer with the Sheriff's Department; Cain Mayrant, employee of the Detention Center; James Moore, Sheriff's Department; Patricia Hartman, Sheriff's Department; and Ron Smith, Sheriff's Department.

Ms. Hallman has been with the County since 1991. In February an unmarked Anderson County Sheriff's Department patrol car was broken into while at a Motel 6. Ms. Hallman was able to find the fingerprints which led to the arrest.

Mr. Mayrant was nominated for his honesty, integrity, and diplomacy which contributed to his outstanding success as a correctional officer.

Mr. Moore has been with the Sheriff's Department since 1994. He was described as a very loyal, hard working and professional individual. He is a Resource Officer who often times is called on as the "hostage negotiator."

Ms. Hartman was nominated for her contribution to the detective unit and has been responsible for solving approximately 39 burglaries in the first quarter of 2003. Mr. Brooks stated that she is a team player and never takes entire credit for her success.

Mr. Smith has been with the Sheriff's Department since 1979, and sets up the new employee Identification card system for the department. He also serves as the Human Resource Director for the department.

Mr. Brooks presented a plaque to Vicki Hallman as the Employee for the First Quarter and Certificates of Excellence were presented to Cain Mayrant, James Moore, Patricia Hartman, Ron Smith and Richard Blackwell.

**Presentation of Resolution - Mr. Roger Davis - Councilman John Carrigg** - Mr. Carrigg honored Mr. Davis with a framed resolution for his years of service on the Lexington County Health Services District Board since March 1994.

**Resolutions** - A motion was made by Mr. Wilkerson and seconded by Mr. Derrick that the Resolutions commending Mr. Arnold Screen, Mr. Samuel A. Cheatham and proclaiming JUNE 2003 as "National Home Ownership Month" be adopted.

Mr. Davis opened for discussion; no discussion occurred.

In Favor:	Mr. Davis	Mr. Wilkerson
	Mr. Derrick	Mr. Rucker
	Mr. Keisler	Mr. Jeffcoat
	Mr. Carrigg	Mr. Owens
	Mr. Cullum	

**Appointment - Board of Zoning Appeals - Bryan Clemenz** - A motion was made by Mr. Davis and seconded by Mr. Derrick to appoint Mr. Clemenz to the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Davis opened for discussion; no discussion occurred.

In Favor:	Mr. Davis	Mr. Derrick
	Mr. Carrigg	Mr. Cullum
	Mr. Jeffcoat	Mr. Keisler
	Mr. Owens	Mr. Rucker
	Mr. Wilkerson	

**Riverbanks Park Zoo - Robert P. Wilkins** - A motion was made by Mr. Davis and seconded by Mr. Jeffcoat to reappoint Mr. Wilkins to the Riverbanks Par Zoo.

Mr. Davis opened for discussion; no discussion occurred.

In Favor:	Mr. Davis	Mr. Jeffcoat
	Mr. Carrigg	Mr. Cullum
	Mr. Derrick	Mr. Keisler
	Mr. Owens	Mr. Rucker
	Mr. Wilkerson	

**Chairman's Report** - Mr. Davis reported that he and Mr. Derrick were present at the May 8, 2003 meeting when Mr. Compton received a plaque from the Lexington County Soil and Water Conservation District. Mr. Davis announced that he is a new "Grandfather" as of June 2, 2003 with a new grandson.

**Administrator's Report** - No report.

**Budget Amendment Resolutions** -

Supplemental Appropriation Increase - An \$8,000.00 appropriation increase for the Professional

June 3, 2003:Page

5

Bond Fees as they were higher than anticipated in the Clerk of Court's office.

Supplemental Appropriation Increase - A \$3,000.00 appropriation increase for earned interest on the Water Recreation Resource Tax funds for the boat patrol station at Bundrick Island.

Supplemental Appropriation Increase - A \$5,000.00 appropriation increase from the South Carolina Emergency Management Division, Office of the Adjutant General, to cover expenses for the Cobra Team exercises on June 3 & 4, 2003.

Mr. Carrigg questioned the Professional Bond Fees. He stated that there was a short-fall in one of the Clerk of Court's account and asked if that could not be used to off-set the interest occurred rather than use the contingency fund.

Mr. Porth stated that the Professional Bond Fees were handled at the discretion of the Clerk of Court.

Mr. Cullum asked why the fund was short.

Mr. Carrigg stated that it was short because it was a trust account for child support payments and there was just a "hand-shake" deal on the interest. When the interest rates fell, the bank charges exceeded \$23,000.

Mr. Davis stated that the account had not been reconciled for two years and asked Mr. Porth to answers questions regarding the interest shortage.

Mr. Porth stated from a financial standpoint that money should be recorded as interest or additional fees in that fund because there is a fund set up for Professional Bond Fees in the Clerk of Court's office. He stated that the fund will have approximately \$100,000 in contingency to use to make up for the service charges of the short fall in the bank account. He stated that the Professional Bond Fees could be used for the interest since this money is to be handled by the Clerk of Court at his discretion to run and pay expenses of his office.

Mr. Derrick made a motion and seconded by Mr. Cullum that no action be taken at this time but have the Clerk of Court address Council at the next meeting.

Mr. Davis opened the meeting for discussion; no discussion occurred.

In Favor:	Mr. Davis	Mr. Derrick
	Mr. Cullum	Mr. Wilkerson
	Mr. Carrigg	Mr. Jeffcoat
	Mr. Keisler	Mr. Owens
	Mr. Rucker	

**Ordinances 03-2 - Building Codes Ordinance Amendments - 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading** - Mr. Rucker stated that during the afternoon meeting his committee met to discuss Ordinance 03-2. Mr. Rucker stated there are four major areas regarding Ordinance 03-2. He stated that the 2000 National Electrical Code by State Law had to be adopted after January 1, 2003 but no later than July 1, 2003; change the number of Board Members from seven to nine; modification of re-inspection procedures; verbiage and terminology clarification.

Mr. Rucker made a motion, seconded by Mr. Jeffcoat that Ordinance 03-2 be given second reading.

Mr. Davis opened the meeting for discussion; no discussion occurred.

In Favor:	Mr. Davis	Mr. Rucker
	Mr. Jeffcoat	Mr. Derrick
	Mr. Carrigg	Mr. Keisler
	Mr. Owens	Mr. Rucker
	Mr. Wilkerson	

**Planning & Administration, Mr. Bruce Rucker, Chairman - Digital Ortho/Topo Project Funding (Including approval of pricing scheme)** - Mr. Rucker stated that during the afternoon meeting the committee met and discussed Digital Ortho/Topo Project Funding.

Mr. Rucker made a motion, seconded by Mr. Cullum to adopt the Digital Ortho/Topo Project for FY-03-04 in the amount of \$238,270 and to also adopt the Pricing Scheme #2. 1 to 9 grids, orthos - \$50, topos \$300; 10 to 99 grids, orthos - \$40 topos -\$260; 100+ grids, orthos - \$30, topos - \$100.

Mr. Davis opened the meeting for discussion; no discussion occurred.

In Favor:	Mr. Davis	Mr. Rucker
	Mr. Cullum	Mr. Derrick
	Mr. Jeffcoat	Mr. Keisler
	Mr. Owens	Mr. Carrigg
	Mr. Wilkerson	

**South Carolina Rural Access to Emergency Devices Grant (SCRAED)**- Mr. Rucker stated that his committee also discussed a grant for the rural area of the county and asked that Mr. Derrick provide the report.

Mr. Derrick asked that the committee take this up in today's meeting as a special item. He stated

June 3, 2003:Page

8

that this was a grant that was received today, June 3, 2003 which is for defibrillators. The eligible areas are Batesburg Fire Station, Batesburg/Leesville Rescue Squad and Fairview Fire



Station. He indicated that there is no match on the County's part.

Mr. Derrick made a motion, seconded by Mr. Keisler to go forward to secure the grant money.

Mr. Davis opened the meeting for discussion; no discussion occurred.

In Favor:	Mr. Davis	Mr. Derrick
	Mr. Keisler	Mr. Carrigg
	Mr. Jeffcoat	Mr. Cullum
	Mr. Owens	Mr. Rucker
	Mr. Wilkerson	

**BAR-Digital Ortho/Topo Project** - Mr. Brooks stated that he had a budget amendment which would ratify the action taken on the BAR Digital Ortho/Topo Project Funding.

**Public Works, Mr. William Derrick, Chairman - Municipal C Fund Recommendations-** Mr. Derrick stated that during the afternoon meeting the committee met to discuss the Municipal "C" Fund recommendations. He stated that it has been a policy to distribute \$50,000 to projects in municipalities. If there were only five applications, it would be distributed equally; more than five applications it would be distributed on a need basis. There were five total applicants for this year in the amount of \$10,000 each; City of West Columbia to resurface Saluda River Drive; Town of Pelion for assistance with drainage at the corner of Railroad Avenue and Norris Street; Town of Lexington to resurface Third Avenue, between Hendrix Street and Main Street; City of Cayce for a detailed engineering/hydraulic study of the "Indigo Drainage Basin"; Batesburg/Leesville for Oak Street Streetscape.

A motion was made by Mr. Derrick and seconded by Mr. Wilkerson that the Municipal "C" Funds recommendations as outlined above be approved.

Mr. Davis opened the meeting for discussion; no discussion occurred.

In Favor:	Mr. Davis	Mr. Derrick
	Mr. Wilkerson	Mr. Cullum
	Mr. Jeffcoat	Mr. Keisler
	Mr. Owens	Mr. Rucker
	Mr. Carrigg	

**Justice, Mr. John Carrigg, Chairman** - Mr. Carrigg stated that the Justice Committee met today to discuss a request from the Sheriff's Department to apply for a COPS Homeland Security Overtime Program Grant. He stated that this was a 75% / 25% one-year program. Total request would be \$129,489 to fund overtime. The Federal portion would be \$97,117 and Lexington County Sheriff's Department would provide \$32,372 out of the department's existing budget. No

additional funding is requested.

A motion was made by Mr. Carrigg and seconded by Mr. Wilkerson that the Sheriff's Department move forward with applying for the grant.

Mr. Davis opened the meeting for discussion; no discussion occurred.

In Favor:	Mr. Davis	Mr. Carrigg
	Mr. Wilkerson	Mr. Derrick
	Mr. Jeffcoat	Mr. Keisler
	Mr. Owens	Mr. Rucker
	Mr. Cullum	

**Executive Session/Legal Briefing** - A motion was made by Mr. Cullum and seconded by Mr. Owens to go into Executive Session to review several contractual matters.

In Favor:	Mr. Davis	Mr. Cullum
	Mr. Owens	Mr. Derrick
	Mr. Jeffcoat	Mr. Keisler
	Mr. Carrigg	Mr. Rucker
	Mr. Wilkerson	

Mr. Davis reconvened the meeting in open session.

Prior to the public hearing, Chairman Davis read the guidelines for participation.

### **6:00 P.M. - Public Hearings**

#### **(1) Ordinance 03-3- FY 03-04 General Fund and Non-General Fund Budgets**

Mr. Davis opened the meeting for comments from the public.

#### **Gary R. Baker, County Veterans Service Officer, 605 W. Main St., Lexington, SC 29072**

Mr. Baker stated he was here tonight on behalf of the 24,000 veterans of Lexington County. We are the sixth largest population of veterans in the state; bring in just under \$29 million in expenditures for medical care, pensions, aide-in-attendance, and disability payments. When you consider that this money goes through our economy several times, you can see the impact the veterans in Lexington County (24,000) has on the economy. We are anticipating a 19% increase in our service levels this year. Better than a 30% increase in veterans by the year 2012 according to the Department of Veterans Affairs. What we are asking for here today, is that you consider an increase in the budget of the Veterans Affairs office. When the budget papers were due, I had been on board for about three weeks and noticed that my predecessor had requested a clerk for the office but I was not sure that it was necessary. Having been there for four months, I see the work load and with what we intend to do in that office we can certainly use it. We are doing outreach

among the veterans organizations, hospitals, and nursing homes. We are going to be doing newspaper and local temporary offices around the county and we need assistance in the office in order to do this. We have asked for one clerk, \$29,513 with benefits to take care of routine word processing, filing, answering the phones, etc.

**Geri Lynn Harrison, Senior Deputy Clerk, 139 E. Main St., Lexington, SC 29072** - I am here this evening gentlemen to speak with you concerning our request for additional personnel in our budget. I realize that everybody is hard pressed and probably every department has asked for more people, but I have a lot of notes and things that my Clerk gave me but I have just decided that I am going to talk to you from the heart. I have worked here for 25 years. I have worked for three different clerks and I have also lived in the county that long. I have seen with my own eyes that the employees in our office are sinking fast. They have requested just about every year, that I can remember, additional personnel and I have one division in particular that has asked for a person just about every year and it has been 28 years since we have had another person in that department. Some of you are familiar with the court system; you understand the workings; the filings of lawsuits and the pleadings and paperwork that go with that. There is just no way that that division can continue to function with the same number of employees that it has had for the last 28 years. I don't think any of you who own a business say that you still run your company with the same number of employees you had 28 years ago or would be able to run it with that. The citizens of this county deserve better service and we can't give it to them unless we get some help. Our departments, all three of our departments, Family Court, Common Pleas, and General Sessions are all regulated by the legislature and Court Administration. We don't have a say in the rules that are made for us to run our courts by. We are just given the rules and we have to make do. Over the years, the county has grown, you all know that, and with the influx of the population, the increase in crimes has grown tremendously; the increase in civil lawsuits has grown tremendously, the responsibilities of the family court and child support are overwhelming and if we don't get some help, then the taxpayers aren't going to get what they paid for. I am a taxpayer, too. I am not happy when my taxes go up, I'll tell you that right now. I probably fuss and moan more than anybody but I realize working everyday in the system that if we don't get a little bit of relief, it is going to hurt all of us. Not just the employees, not just the people who work for the county but all the citizens of the county. Child support is not going to get out like it is suppose to, the court cases are not going to be put on the docket as rapidly as they should because we can't get the paperwork to the files fast enough. I have numerous numbers and figures but you all have been given that in your budget packages, which we turned in, and I know that you have looked over it and have given it a lot of consideration, but I guess what we are just asking for is a little piece of the pie. We have two divisions who do make money for this county. One is a service oriented and really doesn't bring in a lot of money. Both our General Sessions and our Family Court bring in an enormous amount of money that goes into the general fund for the county. The increase in family court cost went from 3% to 5% and with that increase during the last year that increased our contributions to the county general fund by close to \$180,000. If we can just get one new person in each department, I don't know about the rest of the people in my office, but I know I would say "thank you" many times over. I have seen these people work

late. I have seen them work weekends; take work home with them. We are trying to cut down on our overtime but it is just impossible when the court says you have to stay, you have to stay. We can't just get up and leave at 5:00. We have no control over that. When a roster has to get out for the next term of court, you have to stay. If you have to be in the courtroom all day long, then you have to stay after work to get that done. We are trying to provide the best services possible for the people of this county and the biggest problem is that the employees who are putting forth more than 100% effort are becoming overworked, stressed out and that is causing more illness and sick time to be taken. I'm not a numbers whiz but I can tell you that it makes sense to me that it would be a lot more beneficial to the county to pay an employee \$5.00 an hour or \$8.00 (this is not what I am asking you to pay these people) but pay an employee \$5.00 an hour for 8 hours work than pay an employee who makes \$10.00 an hour at time and half for their overtime hours and then they have to take time off because they have been overworked and stressed out. We are running out of answers; we are running out of solutions and we are just begging for a little bit of help. Just give us an opportunity. If you give us a little bit of help, we can give you better services; we can provide for this county and the citizens what they deserve. Thank you.

Mr. Jeffcoat asked Ms. Harrison if the Clerk's office has not had any new people in it at all in the last 28 years.

Ms. Harrison replied, no sir, one division. There is one division, the civil division. We actually have four people and one of those is actually on the Teri plan right now. She has put her 30 years in and is on the Teri plan. We have depended on June to tell us and she was like, I have been here in this department the whole time and no we have not had an additional employee in this division.

Mr. Jeffcoat asked if there was a possibility that you could use other employees in that division, has that happened in 28 years.

Ms. Harrison replied that everyone of the employees in that department is swamped.

Mr. Jeffcoat asked if you could take one out of a different department and shift it over.

Ms. Harrison replied, "Mr. Jeffcoat, if we could, we would." All the departments are overwhelmed and if there was any way to rearrange, reorganize, we would have done that a long time ago.

Mr. Owens asked Ms. Harrison if she was identifying civil court as her greatest of the three needs.

Ms. Harrison replied, "I guess I am going out on a limb and say, yes sir." She said if she had to prioritize, yes, I would say that is my first priority there.

Mr. Owens asked Ms. Harrison if she had dollars and cents for salary.

Mr. Carrigg stated that the clerk had requested six new positions and one upgrade.

Ms. Harrison said she was speaking personally, but we requested more. I am here on hands and knees begging for at least three. But as far as the Common Pleas that Mr. Owens was speaking about, the civil division, we requested two in that department.

Mr. Carrigg stated you requested a Clerical Assistant Grade 4 and an ADR Manager. We had already addressed the ADR person.

Ms. Harrison replied, yes sir, I understand that. So what is left is the Clerical Assistant I which is a grade 4 position. Also there was a new position for an In-take Clerk, grade 6. Mr. Carrigg asked, what department. Ms. Harrison responded basically administration, they assist in all three departments as far as taking in new pleadings, new cases so I can't really categorize them as one of those three, they would work for all three sections. We had also requested an upgrade, new position for the records room. That position is currently being paid for by Title IV-D funds. The Title IV-D has to do with family court. When it originated, the majority of the work that that individual was doing was related to Family Court. Since that position started, the responsibilities has changed drastically and more than half of their time is actually spent working on civil matters and assisting some with criminal matters; and then a small portion is in the Title IV-D so we had requested that that be made a county funded position rather than being paid for out of the Title IV-D funds.

**Bert Pooser, Sheraton Convention/Center Hotel, 1 Surrey Court, Columbia, SC 29212**

Mr. Chairman and Council members, I thank you for allowing me to speak briefly about the CVB, the Convention Center funding. I know most of you and, you know over the years, there have been times that I have been a little unhappy with what I thought the CVB did for my hotels in Lexington County. But, now the convention center is coming on board and Steve Camp is now President and CEO of the Convention Center Authority and which is also responsible for the CVB, I feel that we are going to get our fair share of business in Lexington County and I am speaking for the other hotels in Lexington County that collect the accommodations taxes which are the funds used to fund the CVB. We also have new, this year, Columbia Regional Sports Council and this will generate a lot of business for Lexington County. Of course, we have a lot of softball business over here in the summer, which generates a lot of business for our hotels. We have, this year, a big tennis function going on which really occupies Lexington County tennis facilities and Richland County. The CVB now has a \$700,000 marketing budget for this year and these funds, of course, come from the accommodations taxes. In the past Lexington County has given 30% of those funds to the CVB and this year we understand that Council has reduced that to about half. I just want to make a comment about the \$700,000 budget. If you give approximately the same amount as last year, which is \$90,000, that represents only about 13% of the marketing budget for the CVB. I can assure you that we in Lexington County will get our fair share and I think with the 13% of the funding it's a good deal for Lexington County. I'm asking that we be

consistent in our funding for the CVB and under Steve Camp's leadership, and now that they are fully staffed, I feel confident that the CVB will do what they are suppose to do for the Lexington County hotels. Thank you.

Mr. Carrigg asked Mr. Pooser to address to Council how the CVB differs from the Convention Center Authority. What the difference of the jobs of those two entities are.

Mr. Pooser stated that the Convention and Visitors Bureau generates business for the whole area and they market and promote the entire area. The Convention Center Authority is really involved with the convention center which is being built downtown now. Lexington County gave a lot of money for that but that comes out of another tax fund; a Tourism tax which is 3%.

Mr. Wilkerson asked whether the money we are appropriating to the Lake Murray Convention Bureau if they were helping him anyway now as far as advertising his business, etc. or could they, in the future, do a little bit more to help out.

Mr. Pooser said a couple of years ago that the Lake Murray Tourism was able to help us out more than they have been able to in the last couple of years and primarily because there are more hotels in this area, some of them in the City of Columbia, and a lot of the functions that Lake Murray Tourism puts on guests stay in those properties because they have a little lesser rate for them.

**Steve Camp, President & CEO, Midland's Regional Conventional Center Authority, 900 Assembly Street, P.O. Box 15, Columbia, SC 29202** - I am also here to talk about the CVB funding. The Convention and Visitor's Bureau has worked hard over the past year to be a more effective organization who takes it's mission seriously. Our goal is to be accountable to all of those who support us and to return to those supporters distinguishable results to justify their support. We recognize the fact that it is often difficult to explain how sending funding outside your county lines can return meaningful results to your county. But, I do think you can be assured that in recent months your monies have been invested wisely in regional marketing and that those efforts have delivered acceptable results for the hospitality industry in Lexington County. I was asked by one of the Council members to try to come up with some figures in the last couple of days and I think these are fairly accurate, though I hope in time I could refine these. But I think in the year 2002, about 6,580 people attended meetings or conventions in Lexington County. That represents an economic impact of about \$3.6 million. That does not include city-wide conventions. This is a guess, but I took a conservative estimate. The city-wide conventions drew 38,810 attendees in 2002. If only 10% of those ended up staying in Lexington County that is 3,880, which is using the PRT economic impact numbers would add about \$700,000. If you total those, it is over \$4 million of economic impact. In 2003 some of those events have happened, some of these are to happen. These figures could fluctuate a little bit. We estimate that 7,205 people will attend meetings and conventions in Lexington County. This will have an economic impact of almost \$4 million. City-wide conventions will number over 52,000 attendees this year which, again, if 10% stay over here that is another 5,245 attendees in Lexington County for an economic impact of an additional almost \$1 million. So we are talking about in the vicinity of

\$4.5 and 5 million of economic impact this year. We are making progress in our efforts to market the region, but to assure that we continue to improve our efforts and results, we do need consistency in our funding. Should you decide to redirect your designation of the 30% accommodations tax, the proposed \$48,500 reduction in the CVB \$700,000 budget will have an immediate and definable negative impact on our efforts to promote the region, specifically Lexington County. On behalf of the Conventions and Visitor's Bureau and the hotel community of Lexington County, I ask you to reconsider and continue to send the 30% designation to the CVB. Thank you.

Mr. Derrick asked Mr. Camp that out of the \$900,000 that we collect from the other tax, the hospitality tax, and that also has a "marketing arm" will that marketing are not be promoting Lexington County?

Mr. Camp said the Tourism Development fee funds the convention center. Accommodations tax funds the CVB or marketing.

Mr. Camp said that the marketing money is designated to market the convention center and obviously in marketing the convention center we also market the region. But, I am obligated by the funding agreement to designate that as marketing for the convention center only so it is hard for me in the budgeting process to let that money flow over into the separate budget that I have for the CVB.

Mr. Derrick stated that we have been sold a "bill of goods" because we were given the impression that we were going to market this entire area with that money.

Mr. Camp replied that we do market the area for the convention center but it can not flow over into the CVB, the regional marketing. It is two different sets of funds.

Mr. Derrick stated that as we are addressing this that we should also address that when the original agreement was drawn up, that was for brick and mortar and nothing else, and now it has become an advertising budget and an operations budget for some 20 years.

Mr. Camp said this was done even before he arrived. The funding that Lexington County has set up, the Tourism Development fee, goes to pay the debt service on the convention center and then it funds, and I think wisely so, it funds, over time, a replacement amount of 1%, like \$370,000 a year, for replacement of equipment as you move forward. It also funds, if it is there and if it is collected, then the third call on that money is the marketing money for the convention center. It is written in the funding agreement so that is what you agreed to when you drew up that funding agreement. I don't want you to think that we are going to sit over there and just advertise the convention center without saying "come to our convention center and visit the region" so yes, some of that flows over. We have to be very careful because it is earmarked convention center and I can't put it over in the CVB budget and use it at will because it is not the way you drew up the rules.

**Bob Staton, 155 Rudder Court, Lexington, SC 29072** - I have some good news to start with; there are two more speakers behind me and they are not going to speak. I am Chairman of the River Alliance and what I am here to do is to encourage you to continue the funding of the River Alliance that you have done. We are not asking for an increase but continue the funding that has been there in the past for the River Alliance. We are jointly funded by the City of Columbia, Richland County, and Lexington County and, I think particularly, from a Lexington County standpoint this has been really a unique year. If any of you have been over to Cayce and West Columbia and have seen what has opened up over there along the river, I think it is just a great happening that has gone on and your support has made that possible and your continued support will enable us to continue to expand and carry out the vision and the plan of the River Alliance. In fact, there is something down there Thursday at 11:00 to dedicate some new signage that is going on from the historical perspective. We encourage you to continue the same funding that you have done in the past and to thank you for your support in the past.

Mr. Cullum stated that he is a huge advocate of the River Alliance and the short time he has been on Council he has already seen the great benefits that it is going to be for his area and West Columbia. He stated that it was a huge attraction for Lexington County, as he is told from city administration of Cayce and West Columbia, that visitors routinely question that area from other parts of the county, Richland County, even other parts of the state, as well as out of state visiting the River Walk..

Mr. Camp also introduced Mr. Bob Livingston, Vice-Chair of the River Alliance and Mike Dawson, Executive Director of the River Alliance.

Mr. Wilkerson stated that he remembered when this first started. Since it has taken off great things are happening and thanked the River Alliance for all the good work.

Due to a malfunction of the recording equipment, presentations by the following could not be transcribed:

**Dayton Riddle, Solicitor's Office, 105 S. Lake Drive, Lexington, SC 29072**  
**Sharon Dallas, Aiken/Barnwell/Lexington Community Action Program**  
**Robert B. Hayes, League of the South, State Director, 100-1 Bowie St., Abbeville, SC 29620**  
**Jon Bradford, Babcock Center, P.O. Box 3817, Columbia, SC 29230**  
**Rusty Rentz, 139 Sparkleberry Ln., Lexington, SC 29073, Confederate Memorial Day**  
**E.M. Clark, 3993 Bachman Rd., West Columbia, SC 29172, Confederate memorial Day**  
**Dan Wells, Irmo/Chapin Recreational Commission, 119 Milmont Shores Rd., Chapin, SC**  
**Tom Hammond, Senior Paramedic, Lexington Co., EMS, EMS Shift Change**  
**Eddie Killian, 1122 Meadowfield Rd., Gaston, SC 29053, Confederate Memorial Day**  
**Lourie Salley, Esq., 101 E. Main St., Lexington, SC, Confederate Memorial Day**  
**R.O. Levy, 415 Cedar St., Batesburg, SC, Martin Luther King Day**



**Don Gordon, 239 Ashton Circle, Lexington, SC** - I am the Commander of the Wade Hampton Camp of Sons of the Confederate Veterans, and least you think they are all here tonight, we have almost 300 members in our camp. More than half of them reside in Lexington County and there are actually seven camps in Richland and Lexington county that are of varying sizes.

My only brother had to eject out of a flaming jet in Vietnam. My father fought in the Korean War and the jungles of New Guinea. His grandfather fought in Virginia; I'm proud of them all. I am here tonight because Lexington County called my great great-grandfather, David Harmon Taylor, II when he was 19 years old living in Prosperity. He lost an eye in Virginia and he had lost an arm at Petersburg before he came back after serving his state. Then interestingly enough they took his property due to property taxes. So, we are aware that money can be an issue. But, money is not an issue tonight because we have come up with an idea how the Confederate Veterans can be recognized by the County for their service where it wouldn't cost them anything.

I want to say the words that are on the Confederate monument at Gettysburg. Not for fame or fortune, not for place or rank, but in simple obedience to duty as they knew it. That is what these men were all about. They were not fighting for anything controversial, they were being invaded. The last line on the Confederate monument to the dead on our capital grounds says, "In the hopelessness of the hospital in the short sharp agony of the field, they found support and consolation in the belief that at home they would not be forgotten." This is their home and we will not be forgetting the actions of this Council and I hope that you will serve your duty with the same pride that they served their own. I am asking you all to in whatever manner you decide is fit to see that the veterans from Lexington County who served in the Confederate army also have their day.

**Tammy Coghill, Director, Community and Economic Development** - I would like to acknowledge the work of Mr. Brooks and Mr. Porth and his staff in pulling together the various budget requests that they had to deal with every year from multiple departments and even departments with multiple accounts to deal with. It is a difficult and likely a very thankless task, I am certain. I do truly feel that our needs are taken into account and certainly understand why new positions are seldom recommended except in cases where they address public safety issues and things such as that.

It has not escaped me that it is very unusual for an appointed department head to be presenting a request before you outside the recommended budget; I certainly recognize and am humble by that and appreciate your time and attention as well as of all involved.

My request today though is tied specifically to the recent reorganization as well as requests and demands by the public and this body for increased service levels or changes in service levels that we provide. And as such, it is certainly outside the typical norm of request for more people and in

addition to that for at least two of the three requests that I bring before you, I bring a funding method to the process as well. Again, I see the request this year as being very unusual because of where it stems from and certainly appreciate your time and attention and certainly don't intend to make this a tradition.

Before the direct plea, some brief history, a number of Council members have changed since some of things have been put into place. Most of you recall the former Planning and Development Department was dissolved in March 2002 with its various functions being redirected to three other departments; Planning and GIS, the Public Works Department, as well as Community and Economic Development, which is the budget that I am representing for you today. At that particular time a vacant position was eliminated from the budget. The position had originally been created for the purpose of establishing a customer services position. That was done by combining two other positions at the time, one was vacant and the duties were combined. Upon the dissolution of Planning and Development, it was determined that the intent of the customer service position could be met through the restructuring that was taking place during that time in March and the funds were redirected elsewhere. Again, I understand there are a number of needs and anywhere that we can find an opportunity to redirect funds to other pressing needs, I certainly can understand that.

Following the retooling of the departments, the plans to move forward also for the establishment of a codes enforcement unit within the Sheriff's Department, this occurred in part because of the success of a quality of life task force that was composed of staff from Zoning from Litter Control, Animal Control, and the Sheriff's Department. The task force combined efforts to clean up and educate communities in targeted areas where each were experiencing significant enforcement issues. We found that each of those departments kept coming in and coming into the same target areas. That task force having been successful in Hendrix Mobile Home Park, as well as others, evolved into a codes force enforcement unit. As many of you know, two of the zoning positions were at that time relocated to the Sheriff's Department to support that effort. Thus, the Department of Community Economic Development, after the restructuring and retooling of P&D, was actually down three employees, which is how the reorganization fits where we are at today. In essence, what I have submitted in the recommended budget what I am here to describe to you today in my request is a request for changing those positions and how they function but basically bring us back to the level where we were at a year ago with being able to apply my experiences over the last year supervising that area to redirect the particular activities and functions of those positions.

The year since then has been one of observation and retooling with myself and the various managers carefully identifying needs and demands while we monitor service levels. I certainly wasn't going to jump in and say wait we need those three people back or we need more. I did not think that was appropriate at all and, again it's very unusual for me to be here and my comments are based on the year of experience and observation. We have initiated several different activities and initiatives in the past year to address customer service in efficiency expectations. These

include providing cell phones to all the building inspectors so that contractors can reach them during the day. Previously they could only respond to calls from contractors and developers in the mornings or in the afternoons, about 45 minutes each when they were back in from their route. This allows them to be contacted through the day and it has been very, very successful. Additionally, we provided uniform shirts to the inspectors so they can be easily identified on the job site. We are accepting permit applications on a dedicated fax machine and we are about to implement a permitting software that will actually allow contractors to check the status of a particular project when the inspections are online. We are developing changes to the website that will include ordinances online as well as the opportunity to apply for or obtain and perhaps even submit applications for various permits on line. Council is certainly participating in our efforts toward our efficiency and customer service by moving forward with the changes to the building codes ordinances that you did address this afternoon and those will also make us more responsive. Unfortunately, while these accomplishments have been exciting to put into place, and we are already seeing the results of them, I am thrilled with some of the results that we have had and the efforts of the staff to put them in. There continues to be some basic service level issues that I wanted to bring to your attention, again from the demands of the public as well as some things that we have found out between Council and staff. I am concerned that a decision needs to be made or a dialogue begun on whether or not we can meet some of those expectations with existing staffing levels. The sheer growth of the County; the associated permitting and inspection increases, the public's expectation that we dispatch someone immediately as soon as we get a phone call and their demand for drive-through permits is making it increasingly difficult to meet our internal goal, and what I am sure is your internal goal, of providing consistently, professional, thorough and efficient service. I would ask you today to consider my request for three very different yet equally important positions that are detailed in the budget request that was submitted in February and I have summarized those in what I handed you today. I realize the particular positions are specifically identified, one is administrative in nature and, quite frankly, it would serve to provide support and services that are not being provided now. It is not a change in service level, other than an increase, and it is tied to expectations that were set when the department was originally set up before the retooling.

Mr. Jeffcoat asked Ms. Coghill what the 1600% increase was about.

Ms. Coghill stated that was in the zoning department, 1600% increase in permits for zoning permits specifically; this is over a multi-year span obviously. That is kind of the history of the department itself. The second request is for a building inspector that is directly related to the discussions we have been having about service levels. Both the building inspector and zoning assistant request each come with suggestions for increases in the fee schedule. Again, I am prepared to talk about this as long as you are willing to listen but you do have in front of you specific information on permitting increases as opposed to staffing level increases. You know by the calls you get that the amount of activity that is going on, and the expectations of the public, permits are absolutely phenomenal. When we compared fees to other jurisdictions and looked at the staff number permitting increase, it is what I would like to do if we are able to put these in

place, it will certainly allow us to continue the steps which we have taken in the last year as far as efficiency, customer service, and being able to provide the continued level of service that we are being asked to do.

Mr. Derrick asked Ms. Coghill whether she had made any attempt to find out what the cost of these services were versus where we are. He stated that he pays 1 full percent when he adds in the inspection cost plus the permitting cost on everything he does as a subcontractor. He indicated that the general contractor has to pay on the entire amount plus buy a business license for an entire amount plus every sub under the general contractor has to buy business licenses and a permit for their amount. So it is stacked all the way down the line. They are getting a full 2 % of the building cost without doing anything but inspecting it two or three times. When you take in consideration all the staffing, secretaries, motor pool, fringes, everything, how close are we to paying for these services?

Ms. Coghill stated that she had the numbers. She said they took one project in Lexington County and applied it to seven other jurisdictions. This is for a commercial building project. With permit fees, we are the seventh lowest out of the eight jurisdictions. What I am proposing would/should cover a year of a person's salary. The increases and the fees proposed would move us from the seventh to the sixth lowest out of the eight jurisdictions we looked at. Overall, the cost of the program, Mr Derrick, I have broken out building inspections, the development side which is zoning, subdivision, and landscape and then administration and as closely as I could tied direct costs of those programs and then also looked at a percentage of the administrative which is myself and clerical support and then an indirect cost for the other using a formula that was provided by our Finance Department; indirect cost that provide other support services; procurement, administration, finance, fleet, building services, etc. Building inspections comes closest to generating revenues that cover the cost of the program as best as I could figure. They are probably about \$100,000 shy. They cover their direct cost with the revenues right now, the cost of the inspector, the building officials, their permit clerks, the indirect cost, they're probably \$100,000 shy of covering the indirect cost. That really is I believe what I hear you asking is, should this stand alone. You get into zoning, landscape, and subdivisions and you are several hundred thousand shy of covering your direct cost. So a fee increase in that area would certainly be phenomenal. If you really wanted to take a policy stand that this service is not used by all our constituents so only those who benefit should pay for the service. Building does come close. It covers its direct cost and the fee increase that we have proposed will cover the direct cost of an additional person but you are not yet at that indirect cost.

Mr. Jeffcoat asked Ms. Coghill if we are talking about three positions; a building inspector, administrative, and zoning assistant.

Mr. Jeffcoat stated, well, what we're talking about here, I think, Mr. Chairman, is, we're talking about three positions - one is an inspector, is that correct?

Ms. Coghill replied, yes, sir, building inspector....

Mr. Wilkerson interjected, building inspector, administrative, and.....

Ms. Coghill stated, research and, yes, an administrative level.

Mr. Davis stated, in the same motion or if it gets to a motion, we will include an increase in the fees for the coming year?

Mr. Jeffcoat stated, right, yes. I guess we're not.

Mr. Wilkerson added, there yet....

Mr. Jeffcoat commented, we're not entertaining motions.

Mr. Davis stated, no, this is the final speaker at the public hearing, after we close the public hearing, we will start amending the budget.

Ms. Coghill stated and if I could clarify, it is a zoning assistant, we had two removed with the codes enforcement unit, we would like to see one back because not all their duties moved with them, the building inspector would then allow us to make the chief building inspector, pull him off of inspections and actually put him on commercial plan review. What keyed this in was our discussions about plan review turn around time and that up to two weeks was unacceptable for, at least some members of Council as we were discussing it, we have one commercial plan reviewer and, of course, he certainly is pulled to do inspections in the field during absences, that kind of thing. So if the issue of service was, as I understood it, related to plan review, this inspector would then allow us to pull someone, an additional person, to do commercial plan review and that is the reason for that position.

Mr. Wilkerson stated that he appreciated Ms. Coghill running all the numbers and trying to find a way to pay for these positions as much as possible through the permit fees, etc., and it amazes me that the jurisdictions that charge the amount they do compared to what we charge with Cayce, Columbia, Richland County, Lexington, Orangeburg, West Columbia, being ahead of what we charge and I think we need to get more in line with the other jurisdictions that surround us.

Ms. Coghill stated that it was always surprising to look at, and what I was unable to factor in is the fact that, didn't do the math on, is that a number of those jurisdictions also charge an impact fee and as well a business license fee. So unfortunately, a lot of the development in those areas also include those numbers for the cost, so we're probably even lower on the scale.....

Mr. Wilkerson commented, we won't even talk about business license tonight..

Ms. Coghill thanked Council for their time.

Mr. Davis stated since there were no other comments to come before Council we will close the public hearing.

Mr. Davis opened the meeting for amendments to the budget.

**Holidays** - Mr. Carrigg made a motion, seconded by Mr. Wilkerson that Lexington County adopt the legal holidays which are set forth by the State of South Carolina.

Mr. Davis opened the meeting for discussion: no discussion occurred.

In Favor:	Mr. Davis	Mr. Carrigg
	Mr. Wilkerson	Mr. Rucker
	Mr. Derrick	Mr. Owens
	Mr. Cullum	Mr. Keisler
	Mr. Davis	

**Babcock Center** - Mr. Cullum made a motion, seconded by Mr. Owens to include \$15,000 for the Babcock Center.

Mr. Davis opened the meeting for discussion; no discussion occurred.

Mr. Derrick asked where the money would come from. Will it come out of the contingency money that is in there right now?

Mr. Davis replied, yes, sir, it will.

Mr. Porth stated that it would come out of the fund balance

Mr. Derrick asked if that was the Council's budget?

Mr. Jeffcoat responded, yes, sir..

Mr. Carrigg stated for the record that he was going to recuse himself from the vote since he represents someone at the Babcock Center

In Favor:	Mr. Davis	Mr. Cullum
	Mr. Owens	Mr. Jeffcoat
	Mr. Keisler	Mr. Wilkerson

Opposed: Mr. Rucker

Abstaining: Mr. Carrigg Mr. Derrick

**River Alliance** - Mr. Cullum made a motion, seconded by Mr. Carrigg to fund the River Alliance in the amount of \$51,000.

Mr. Davis opened for discussion.

Mr. Derrick stated that he would like to make an observation and that it, the other night we were raising taxes and fund balances and how we were going to finance things. He stated we were talking about cutting the budget another quarter of a million dollars. Tonight we are just ratchetting up "from God knows where," I don't know where all this money is coming from that we are going to be giving these people. He stated if there is not a funding source attached to it, there is no money. We have spent all the estimated revenues. That's just an observation I wanted to make.

Mr. Cullum stated that the money was coming from Economic Development.

Mr. Rucker stated he did not mind funding the River Alliance but wanted to know how much money is in Economic Development to fund the cost.

Mr. Jeffcoat stated that it Economic Development) was in the budget to receive \$250,000 in the committed amount of money that we were to spend last year, we're at \$400,000. He indicated that this year we are going to get \$250,000 and we have already committed for \$300,000; that includes the River Alliance.

Mr. Derrick asked if that included the one-half funding, not the full funding that was discussed?

Mr. Brooks said the budget included full funding.

Ms. Coghill stated that the requested budget, which is reflected in the recommended budget, only reflects \$25,500 for the River Alliance. That was based on the prior year's funding and prior to discussions this group started to have on reinstating the full funding. So the recommended budget is now \$25,500 for that group. The numbers that Mr. Jeffcoat just indicated for commitments already made to other partners for next year presumes full funding. So his numbers for next year presumes full funding which you have in your budget is the half. If you want to do that, the budget will have to be amended. There are monies that we have been able to build up over the years by being judicious about what goes toward projects. There is funding there. I believe Mr. Jeffcoat's comment was relative to annual commitments versus any new monies coming in.

Mr. Jeffcoat stated that we are spending more money than we are bringing in.

Mr. Cullum asked for clarification.

Mr. Cullum stated that the way he understood it last year going through the budget, \$51,000 was budgeted, set aside, for the River Alliance. Staff was authorized to pay two quarters which equal \$25,500 and that left \$25,500 which was paid in March for the third and fourth quarters of this budget.

Mr. Jeffcoat replied that was all we were going to pay.

Mr. Cullum stated that was correct.

Mr. Cullum again stated that last year's budget had \$51,000 budgeted and if we had followed suit with what we had in the prior budget and not what we had authorized for two quarters payment only, so the \$51,000 was there in budget 2003.

Mr. Davis replied that in the document it required Council to increase the amount.

Mr. Cullum stated that he spoke with Mr. Porth about the matter and Mr. Porth included what was actually authorized in the first two quarters.

Mr. Carrigg stated that the Economic Development budget went down. For FY2001-2002, the budget was 3 million dollars. This year the proposed recommended budget is \$1,157,000.

Mr. Jeffcoat stated that it continues to go down and if it keeps going down, then there will be no need to have Economic Development. We will not have any money.

Mr. Owens stated it was a matter of prioritization and he believed in light of some of the things that have gone before this council and been funded, if that Riverwalk is not worthy, then we don't have anything worthy.

Mr. Carrigg stated at one point in time there were plans to connect Saluda Shoals Park with the Lower Saluda.

Mr. Owens replied that it was still ongoing. He stated they have completed probably 60% of West Columbia's, Cayce has done approximately 85% of theirs.

Mr. Carrigg stated that is yet an uncompleted portion of the plan.

Mr. Owens replied, it is. He added that another six miles were being taken on now.

Mr. Carrigg stated the reason he mentioned the connection was because at one point it was sold as "the mission is complete and we don't need the organization any more." He stated that maybe the mission is not complete.



Mr. Owens stated that they have been lucky enough to get some land and we are in the process of trying to go all the up to Hwy.378 completely to Cayce. So if you add what we have done and what we hope to do, we are probably 50% there. He stated we are well ahead of Columbia, they've done very little.

Mr. Davis asked for further discussion on the \$25, 500 amendment.. No discussion occurred.

In Favor:	Mr. Davis	Mr. Cullum
	Mr. Carrigg	Mr. Owens
	Mr. Jeffcoat	Mr. Davis

Opposed:	Mr. Derrick	Mr. Keisler
	Mr. Rucker	

**Community and Economic Development** - A motion was made by Mr. Wilkerson, seconded by Mr. Carrigg to approve the Building Inspector and the Development Zoning Assistant and to implement the Permit Fees so to fund the two new employees.

Mr. Cullum asked if Council would have the opportunity to amend the fee structure or take it as presented.

Mr. Derrick stated that he thought the question was, can you change it later and the answer would be yes.

Mr. Jeffcoat stated that he would support this motion. But as a reminder, when Ms. Coghill was in charge of Economic Development, she was more than a full-time person in that position and then we gave her the Building Inspection Department so she could straighten that department out. He stated she is working about two full-time jobs at present. The Zoning Assistant would be greatly utilized if we could fund a position to help her. We on Council realize that we have had some challenges on the fifth floor. He stated that from most of the calls he receives, most are from the fifth floor. He stated he would like to see someday to "fix" the situation. He agreed two new employees would help, but would not be enough to "complete" the mission. He recommended hiring the three requested employees.

Mr. Wilkerson stated the reason he did not bring it (administrative position) forward was he was uncertain where the funding would come from.

Mr. Jeffcoat stated he understood.

Mr. Cullum commented that he thought Council had the funding mechanism.

Mr. Carrigg added, the fee structure.

Mr. Derrick corrected Mr. Jeffcoat where as he said, the Zoning Assistant, when it should be the Administrative Assistant.

Mr. Davis asked if this was an amendment to the motion?

Mr. Jeffcoat replied, yes.

Mr. Jeffcoat made a motion to amend the motion, seconded by Mr. Cullum to add the Administrative Assistant.

Mr. Wilkerson asked if the fees would be increased to pay for the Administrative Assistant.

Mr. Carrigg stated that the motion, actually indicated the increase fee would be adopted to cover the expenses. It appears staff would be authorized to look at a fee increase to cover the three new employees and bring back a new fee structure to Council. Mr. Carrigg stated that the motion that he seconded was for the new two positions and an amendment to the fee schedule to pay for them. There is now an amendment to that motion to add three positions. The amendment would include the fee schedule.

Mr. Davis replied not the current fee structure but another one.

Mr. Cullum stated that he would like to see the cost of the three new positions in front of Council and what it would take in a fee structure. He indicated if Council changes the fees as proposed now we are going to move up "one" spot. He also stated that if we only move up "two" spots, we are still not going to be within what Cayce and Columbia are paying.

Mr. Jeffcoat stated that the fees should equal your services.

Mr. Cullum stated that we could fund this completely out of the fee structure in the way of "user and impact fees."

Mr. Derrick needed clarification on what amendment we are to vote on. Are we talking about the building fee or the zoning fee or both fees?

Mr. Jeffcoat stated Council was talking about both fees. He stated that since the Administrative Assistant would be working in both of the areas, he thought it could be part of both fees. Mr. Jeffcoat asked Ms. Coghill for clarification.

Ms. Coghill replied, however Council wanted to structure the position. The Administrative Assistant would provide support for both departments.

Mr. Davis stated he thought what Council was asking staff to do is to come back with a new set of fees to pay for the three additional employees for Council to approve. But tonight, we are approving the new three new positions that the department has requested. Then, we will approve the fee structure at a later time.

Vote on Amendment

In Favor:	Mr. Davis	Mr. Wilkerson
	Mr. Carrigg	Mr. Derrick
	Mr. Cullum	Mr. Keisler
	Mr. Owens	Mr. Rucker
	Mr. Jeffcoat	

Vote on Motion as amended

In Favor:	Mr. Davis	Mr. Jeffcoat
	Mr. Cullum	Mr. Derrick
	Mr. Carrigg	Mr. Keisler
	Mr. Owens	Mr. Rucker
	Mr. Wilkerson	

**Solicitor** - A motion was made by Mr. Carrigg and seconded by Mr. Jeffcoat that the Solicitor's budget be amended to include the additional \$25,000 for the computer consulting; additional \$15,000 for legal expenses for death penalty cases; allow the Solicitor to move the receptionist for a one-year period to be paid from the Narcotic Forfeiture account and only one year, and allow a new position which will be paid from the Narcotic Forfeiture fund for the Multi-Jurisdictional Task Force Prosecutor and the grant match will be \$25,666.

Mr. Davis opened the meeting for discussion.

Mr. Cullum stated that he was confused regarding the figures. Mr. Cullum understood there is a grant and the County would be responsible for 25%.

Mr. Carrigg indicated that was correct. He stated that was the \$25,666.

Mr. Cullum asked what was the net cost.

Mr. Carrigg stated that the net cost out of the general fund of that motion is \$40,00; \$25,000 in computer contracting fees, \$15,000 in legal expenses. Mr. Carrigg said the \$15,000 in legal expenses will come if it comes, and won't come if it won't come and if anyone wants to amend that out of the motion we can do that. He stated that those expenses will show up to be paid; we might as well budget for them. Mr. Carrigg stated that the Solicitor's office was planning three death penalty cases and those type cases were expensive.

Mr. Derrick asked Mr. Carrigg if the \$25,000 was for software.

Mr. Carrigg stated it was for an employee that had set up a computer system for the Solicitor's office who has since retired and works on a part-time basis. He stated that according to Mr. Riddle the department needed this individual one more year to complete the program.

Mr. Derrick stated he has heard about software programs in the Solicitor's office every year since he has been on Council. He also stated that he has not seen a result from any of the programs and he was under the impression that the I.S. Department were supposed to get involved. He stated that the South Carolina Association of Counties, in cooperation with the Justice Department, he thought, had developed a software program that we don't have to build; just use it. Mr. Derrick stated that if he thought \$25,000 would complete the project, he would vote for it as he is tired of hearing about it. However, he indicated that he did not think the \$25,000 would complete the project.

Mr. Carrigg stated that he made a motion to include everything and if someone wanted to omit something as a courtesy, would that person make a motion to amend his motion, he would second the motion amendment and Council could then vote.

Mr. Owens stated he was more concerned about the missing \$52,000 check that was never found before additional money is moved.

Mr. Carrigg stated he did not know what the Solicitor has told Mr. Riddle or not told Mr. Riddle but he would be willing to "bet" that that money was deposited in McCormick County with other state funds; dispersed and spent.

Mr. Owens asked if Mr. Carrigg if he thought it would be too much of an imposition to have the Solicitor tell Council the whereabouts of the \$52,000.

Mr. Carrigg stated that the Solicitor has been challenged to respond before and apparently it would be an imposition.

A motion was made by Mr. Derrick and seconded by Mr. Carrigg to amend the motion to delete the \$25,000 for any software until the IS Department investigates and make a determination of the software program.

Mr. Cullum asked if this amendment would the \$15,000 for legal expenses in the original motion? Mr. Carrigg responded, yes.

Vote on Amendment:

In Favor:	Mr. Davis	Mr. Derrick
	Mr. Cullum	Mr. Jeffcoat
	Mr. Keisler	Mr. Owens

Mr. Rucker

Mr. Wilkerson

Opposed: Mr. Carrigg

A motion by Mr. Wilkerson and seconded by Mr. Rucker to amend the motion that the \$15,000 for legal expenses be approved only as an as “needed” basis.

Mr. Davis opened the meeting for discussion.

Mr. Carrigg stated that is a line item for legal expenses and it has been identified for that particular expense.

Mr. Cullum stated he understood Mr. Wilkerson’s feeling on the issue. He asked that Council keep that same line of reasoning when other departments bring up things that may not be needed.

Mr. Wilkerson agreed with Mr. Cullum, but added, with all the problems Council has been having in that area, he thought Council needed to wait and see what happens.

Vote on Amendment:

In Favor:	Mr. Davis	Mr. Wilkerson
	Mr. Rucker	Mr. Carrigg
	Mr. Keisler	Mr. Derrick
	Mr. Jeffcoat	

Opposed: Mr. Owens Mr. Cullum

Mr. Rucker asked if the motion included two positions?

Mr. Davis replied, yes.

Mr. Rucker asked whether or not if the state did not help fund them.

Mr. Carrigg replied that the receptionist was a state funded position, which is to be paid out of Narcotic Forfeiture funds.

Mr. Rucker commented, these were state funded positions and now that the solicitor wants the county to pick them up.

Mr. Carrigg stated no, he does not.

Mr. Rucker stated that these two positions will not be funded next year.

Mr. Carrigg stated, if the solicitor runs out of money .....

Mr. Carrigg stated that the Solicitor has money in the Narcotic Forfeiture account to pay the salaries of the new positions.

Mr. Rucker asked where the money came from.

Mr. Carrigg replied drug forfeiture.

Mr. Rucker stated that this means that no Lexington County tax money will pay for these two positions. Mr. Davis and Mr. Carrigg stated, that's correct. Mr. Rucker stated if next year he does not have this money, then we will have to go back and look at funding these two positions.

Mr. Carrigg responded, no, we're not going to look at them again, we have already told the solicitor.

Mr. Cullum added, it is a one year deal.

Mr. Rucker reiterated as long as no tax money is from Lexington County. He stated that during the afternoon Planning and Administration Committee meeting, discussion involved a state mandate relative to building codes and he was not convinced that this will not cost the County any money, he thought it would. He stated that the state has cut school districts, they've cut municipalities, they've cut the counties, they've cut everyone, and you're telling me we don't have to pick these positions up; as long as we don't have to do that, I'll support it; as long as state or drug money will fund the positions, then he will support it.

Mr. Carrigg stated that is what he had been told, and was what he was relying on. .

Mr. Derrick stated that he would not be supporting this motion because the State did make those cuts. He stated the State did cut the program and is convinced that the drug forfeiture money could be used somewhere else to alleviate the burden that the taxpayers of Lexington County are picking up. He also stated that even though it is drug forfeiture money, Lexington County should be getting the money to alleviate some tax burden in the county, but instead because the State cut the budget, Lexington County winds up losing again.

Mr. Rucker replied to Mr. Derrick that was a good point that he had not thought about.

Mr. Cullum asked for the motion to be restated.

Mr. Davis stated that the motion, as amended includes the prosecutor which involves a grant and necessary funds will come out of the narcotics forfeiture fund as will the funds for the administrative assistant clerk.

Mr. Carrigg added, and the \$15,000 for legal expenses, but only as needed.

Mr. Davis stated, right, the \$15,000 additional as needed; he added that he was unsure how that would be budgeted.

Mr. Owens commented that the \$15,000 was voted down.

Mr. Davis stated that the motion which passed was worded to be paid as needed.

Mr. Owens stated, but it (the additional \$15,000) will have to come back up.

Mr. Davis stated that any expenditures involving the additional \$15,000 will have to come back before Council.

Mr. Owens noted that the funds for the positions would be paid out of the narcotics forfeiture fund.

Mr. Davis asked if everyone understood the amended motion.

Mr. Rucker stated that he wanted to make sure the \$15,000 was budgeted, but each time funds are needed, the request would have to come before Council for a vote.

Mr. Davis indicated that he did not think the funds were going to be budgeted.

Mr. Rucker stated the funds would have to be budgeted.

Mr. Davis stated that if the funds are budgeted he thought that (BAR) would be the proper accounting method.

Mr. Davis stated that the amended motion included the \$15,000, but any expenditure of funds would come before Council, and the two positions to be funded through the narcotics forfeiture fund.

In Favor:	Mr. Carrigg	Mr. Jeffcoat
	Mr. Owens	Mr. Cullum

Opposed:	Mr. Davis	Mr. Keisler
	Mr. Derrick	Mr. Wilkerson
	Mr. Rucker	

**Clerk of Court** - A motion was made by Mr. Owens and seconded by Mr. Carrigg to add one additional employee, clerk, grade 4 salary \$20,358, to the Clerk of Court in the civil area.

Mr. Davis opened the meeting for discussion.

An amendment was made by Mr. Derrick and seconded Mr. Cullum to fund the additional employee only if the Clerk of Court takes the money out his so called "piggy bank." Mr. Owens stated that he did not know if the Clerk of Court had a piggy bank. Mr. Derrick asked what was the balance that was currently in this so called "piggy bank."

Mr. Derrick reiterated that he (Clerk of Court) does have a piggy bank.

Mr. Wilkerson stated that the Clerk of Court can do that; Council did not have to approve it if he wants to do that.

Mr. Jeffcoat asked if Council could approve the position but not provide funds?

Mr. Derrick stated that Mr. Babbitt needed to address the issue, or Mr. Porth if she doesn't know.

Ms. Babbitt stated that the Clerk of Court has an account called Professional Bond Fees. She stated that she and Mr. Porth had looked up the law and it can be used for the Clerk of Court's operating expenses. She stated that there was approximately \$100,000 in the Professional Bond Fees account.

Mr. Carrigg asked if this was an accumulation over the years.

Mr. Babbitt responded, yes.

Mr. Jeffcoat stated that \$23,000 of the Professional Bond Fees could go toward the bank fees.

Mr. Derrick stated about a month ago Council was talking about electronic services which were suppose to increase the efficiency in the Clerk of Court's office with copies, filing, etc.

In Favor of Amendment:

Mr. Davis	Mr. Derrick
Mr. Cullum	Mr. Jeffcoat

Opposed:

Mr. Carrigg	Mr. Keisler
Mr. Owens	Mr. Rucker
Mr. Wilkerson	

In Favor of Original Motion:

Mr. Owens	Mr. Keisler
Mr. Carrigg	



Opposed:	Mr. Cullum	Mr. Jeffcoat
	Mr. Derrick	Mr. Davis
	Mr. Rucker	Mr. Wilkerson

**Convention and Visitors Bureau** - A motion was made by Mr. Carrigg and seconded by Mr. Owens to fund the CVB at the level that Capital City Lake Murray Country was funded which was \$85,000. That will leave the Capital City Lake Murray Country at 30%.

Mr. Davis opened the meeting for discussion.

Mr. Rucker asked where Council was getting the money.

Mr. Carrigg replied from contingency in the accommodations tax fund..

In Favor:	Mr. Carrigg	Mr. Cullum
	Mr. Davis	Mr. Jeffcoat
	Mr. Owens	Mr. Rucker

Opposed:	Mr. Keisler	Mr. Wilkerson
	Mr. Derrick	

**Veterans Affairs** - A motion was made by Mr. Derrick and seconded by Mr. Rucker to fund a part-time employee for the Veterans Affairs office. .

Mr. Davis opened for discussion.

Mr. Carrigg asked the source of funding.

Mr. Porth responded, fund balance.

In Favor:	Mr. Davis	Mr. Derrick
	Mr. Rucker	Mr. Carrigg
	Mr. Keisler	Mr. Mr. Rucker
	Mr. Wilkerson	

Opposed: Mr. Owens

Abstaining: Mr. Jeffcoat

**Economic Development** - A motion was made by Mr. Jeffcoat and seconded by Mr. Cullum to increase the funding to \$400,000 for Economic Development.

Mr. Davis opened the meeting for discussion.

Mr. Owens asked the amount in the recommended budget.

Mr. Cullum replied, \$250,000.

In Favor:	Mr. Davis	Mr. Jeffcoat
	Mr. Cullum	Mr. Derrick
	Mr. Jeffcoat	Mr. Keisler
	Mr. Owens	Mr. Rucker
	Mr. Wilkerson	Mr. Carrigg

**Cultural Council** - A motion was made by Mr. Carrigg and seconded by Mr. Jeffcoat to reinstate the funding to the Cultural Council of Lexington/Richland Counties from \$20,000 to \$40,000.

Mr. Davis opened the meeting for discussion.

Mr. Jefferson stated that the Cultural Council, during the week, appropriated \$18,000 to organizations in Lexington County. He stated that \$40,000 was a sizable amount of money but we were getting many times that back.

After further discussion, Mr. Davis stated that the Cultural Council was in the 03-04 budget at the recommended amount of \$40,000.

A motion was made by Mr. Derrick and seconded by Mr. Cullum to reduce the funding to the Cultural Council of Lexington/Richland Counties from \$40,000 to \$20,000

Mr. Davis opened the meeting for discussion; no discussion occurred.

In Favor:	Mr. Derrick	Mr. Cullum
Opposed:	Mr. Carrigg	Mr. Davis
	Mr. Jeffcoat	Mr. Rucker
	Mr. Wilkerson	
Abstaining:	Mr. Owens	
	Mr. Keisler	

**Solid Waste Management** - A motion was made by Mr. Derrick and seconded by Mr. Jeffcoat to take \$893,000 out of the fund balance to fund capital items for Solid Waste.

Mr. Davis opened the meeting for discussion.

Mr. Jeffcoat stated, that's in lieu of a tax increase.

Mr. Derrick commented, that's in lieu of a 2 mill tax increase.

Mr. Carrigg wanted to know if Council can spend the money without violating the 25 % reserve.

Mr. Porth stated that the question was hard to answer.

A motion was made by Mr. Cullum to amend the motion to purchase just one piece of equipment. Mr. Carrigg asked which piece would be purchased?

Mr. Carrigg asked Mr. Derrick if he understood the question?

Mr. Derrick replied that he understood completely.

Mr. Carrigg asked Mr. Derrick if he would be willing to accept a friendly amendment that funding would be contingent upon Council not violating its own 25% reserve rule?

Mr. Porth stated that whether the percentage reserve amount was violated would not be known until some time in the Fall. He stated that if he had to guess, the county probably had the capacity to do it. He added that the danger is the use of non-recurring sources for an item in Solid Waste that is a recurring capital item.

Mr. Davis stated that the guess is you could take the monies out of the fund balance and still have reserve.

Mr. Rucker stated that whether the reserve percentage would be affected probably would not be known until October.

Mr. Davis stated that there was a motion and a second on the floor and asked for any further discussion.

Mr. Cullum stated that he wanted to amend the motion to purchase only one piece of equipment.

Mr. Davis called for a second on the amendment.

Mr. Keisler asked if he was correct that if Mr. Derrick's motion was voted on it would not increase taxes or the millage.

The amendment died for lack of a second.

In Favor:	Mr. Davis	Mr. Derrick
	Mr. Jeffcoat	Mr. Owens
	Mr. Carrigg	Mr. Keisler

Opposed:     Mr. Cullum  
              Mr. Wilkerson  
              Mr. Rucker

**Capital Expenditures Over \$5,000** - A motion was made by Mr. Carrigg and seconded by Mr. Owens that every capital expenditure over \$5,000 be brought before Council for additional review before it is made.

Mr. Davis opened the meeting for discussion; no discussion occurred:

In Favor:	Mr. Davis	Mr. Carrigg
	Mr. Owens	Mr. Derrick
	Mr. Jeffcoat	Mr. Keisler
	Mr. Cullum	Mr. Rucker
	Mr. Wilkerson	

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dorothy K. Black  
Clerk

George H. Smokey Davis  
Chairman